DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 263 TM 003 224

AUTHOR Gossie, Sandra
TITLE Evaluation of Leadership Laboratory Program Conducted in the Fort Worth Independent School District.
INSTITUTION Fort Worth Independent School District, Tex. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
NOTE 43p.; DIR-1; Conducted with support of the Center for Research and Evaluation, North Texas State Univ. and the Thiokol Chemical Corp.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Grades; *Interpersonal Competence; *Leadership Training; Measurement Instruments; *Program Evaluation; Psychological Tests; Secondary Grades; *Standardized Tests; *Student Testing; Tables (Data); Test Results; Tests
IDENTIFIERS California Psychological Inventory; Fort Worth Independent School District; Intellectual Achievement Responsibility; *Leadership Laboratory for Student Development

ABSTRACT

The Leadership Laboratory for Student Development program, its rationale, objectives, and evaluation findings are discussed. The Leadership Lab, created to prepare a student leader to interact with a variety of people found in the typical school setting, provides students with structured learning experiences that progress from basic communication and group interaction to flexible leadership skills. Evaluation of the program was carried out simultaneously with the training sessions. These sessions were conducted at five high schools, two groups of students in each school, with approximately 17 students in each group. To measure change in interpersonal skills and personality characteristics, pretests were administered at the beginning of the training sessions, and the same tests were again administered at the end of the sessions. The instruments used in testing were the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) and the Intellectual Achievement Responsibility (IAR). Other instruments used to collect information were Student Survey, Student Questionnaire, and Exercise 22-A from the training manual. As not all students returned the posttest and some did not use the same identifying number of the pretest on the posttest, the sample of CPI and the IAR were biased. Results of the evaluation, which are given in 29 tables, showed that personality characteristics and interpersonal skills measured by the CPI did not change over the period of the training sessions to a significant degree, whereas personality characteristics and interpersonal skills represented by the IAR showed significant change. Copies of the CPI, a page of the IAR, the Student Survey, and the Student Questionnaire are provided. (DB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 083263

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EVALUATION OF

LEADERSHIP LABORATORY PROGRAM

CONDUCTED IN THE

FORT WORTH INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

TM 003 224

by
Sandra Gossie
Center for Research and Evaluation
North Texas State University

with the aid of

Nicole White, Research Assistant
Thiokol Chemical Corporation

Supervised by
Charles L. Evans, Ed.D.
Department of Research/Evaluation, FWISD

FOREWORD

The ensuing evaluation was a cooperative enterprise. It was planned and implemented jointly by representatives of the Thiokol Chemical Corporation, the Center for Research and Evaluation at North Texas State University, and the Program Coordinator under supervision of the FWISD's Department of Research and Evaluation.

The Thiokol representative, Nicole White, provided aid in selecting instruments appropriate to the overall goal of the leadership program and provided the description and rationale of the program, including statements relative to goals and objectives. The Program Coordinator, Marilyn Kirkham, provided assistance in the collection of the data.

This evaluation, other than that mentioned above, was written by the representative of the N.T.S.U. Center for Research and Evaluation, Sandra Gossie.

All parties were involved in analyzing the data and generating findings.

Charles L. Evans, Ed.D.
Director
Department of Research/Evaluation

BACKGROUND

The Leadership Laboratory for Student Development, developed under funds provided by the Perot Foundation, was initiated into the Fort Worth Independent School District during the summer of 1972. Due to the enthusiasm and support this small pilot study received, it was decided to conduct leadership training sessions in five high schools throughout the district during the following fall semester. In order to evaluate the impact in terms of the desired learner outcomes, an evaluation design and testing procedures were implemented simultaneously. The leadership program, rationale, objectives, and evaluation findirgs are discussed in this report.

Program Description

The Leadership Laboratory for Student Development was created by Thiokol in response to the need for more effective training of students for positions of leadership. The major goal of the Leadership Lab is to train existing and potential student leaders to deal effectively and intelligently with human relations problems they will encounter as they interact with their peers, faculty members, administrators, parents, and members of the community. Students are provided with structured learning experiences that progress from basic communication and group interaction to flexible leadership skills. The training sequence culminates with problem solving exercises that simulate leadership situations frequently encountered in real life.

The Leadership Laboratory consists of the training procedures and materials required to conduct approximately 35 hours of training for groups of 15 to 20 students. The Laboratory is self-contained with the exception of the audio/visual equipment required and one optional motion picture film.

The role of the lab trainer varies from that of the traditional classroom teacher. The trainer, or group leader, is involved as a ctalyst during training, avoiding an authoritarian role, which in turn encourages students to assume and handle more responsibility in the learning process.

Program Rationale

Students today are becoming increasingly aware of their responsibility to participate in the decision-making process as it concerns events affecting their lives. The hallways of most schools echo with student demands for a voice in the making of school policy. However, many of these same students come woefully ill-equipped to deal with the complex problems of such involvement. The students are discovering that at all levels of decision making, responsible persons everywhere are faced with the same urgent concerns; how to overcome lack of communication, how to interface conflicting values, how to facilitate group goal attainment, and how to handle the inevitable conflicts of our complex and rapidly changing society.

The Leadership Laboratory focuses on many human relations concepts, but centers around one basic premise: "Effective student leadership requires a role of interaction with other people rather than an assigned role of authority or status." The concept of role flexibility as used in the program expands this premise to prepare the student leader to interact with a variety of people found in the typical school setting. A student leader must meet different role expectations of fellow students, administrators, and teachers.

Leadership Laboratory training provides an opportunity for the student to analyze and practice these various role patterns.

Recognizing that student leaders are individuals, each with a unique set of personality characteristics, the Leadership Laboratory utilizes a small group training method which allows all individuals to examine their style of interacting with others. Such group techniques as role playing, simulation exercises, and problem solving allow students to receive feedback about their leadership effectiveness with various groups of people.

Analysis of behavior in a group setting provides student leaders with information about their actions in a group and also promotes understanding of leadership roles in the classroom. Group interaction during the laboratory training is limited to discussion of behavior that is pertinent and transferable to the student leadership role in the school setting.

Program Objectives

The immediate objective of this Leadership Laboratory is to acquaint the student with the importance of human relations skills needed in a student leadership position. It is important that the student begin to understand the ways that his actions affect other people and how the actions of others affect him. The ability of an individual to be sensitive to those around him and to know what is actually happening in interpersonal exchanges is an invaluable tool for anyone in a position of leadership. From this position, a student leader is better qualified to both direct and to accept direction.

A secondary goal in the Leadership Laboratory is to provide the student with exposure to the kinds of interpersonal problems that arise with teachers, administrators, and fellow students. Through observation, analysis, and

experiencing a variety of situational problems, students will gain added insight into what human relations skills are and how they can best use them as tools in being a student and a leader. It is the goal in this program to offer students a set of tools, both cognitive and experiential, that can be used effectively in the school setting.

Further, the training program is aimed at giving students a clearer understanding of the role and responsibilities of a leader. Upon completion of the program, students will have transformed their stereotype of the "good leader" into a viable model that in turn can be used to relate effectively with students, as well as with administrative staff members.

The goals and objectives stated above are general in nature and therefore difficult to measure objectively. Specific behavioral objectives more amenable to objective measurement are to be developed as the program progresses. However, in summary, the Leadership Laboratory has been designed primarily to provide the student with a human relations model that is reality oriented to leadership roles and situations. Communication exercises enable students to gain a better grasp of the complexities of the communication processes in the classroom. Group discussions facilitate feedback from student peers and promote understanding of the group process as it might occur in school. Interpersonal skills activities expand role flexibility and offer an opportunity to test and practice new behavior essential to successful leadership. Finally, problem-solving exercises introduce the kinds of realistic demands placed on the students in their leadership assignments. Generally, these components are mixed in balanced proportions to offer students an added dimension with which to meet the need for responsible and effective student leadership.

PROCEDURES

Treatment Implementation

Leadership training sessions were conducted at five high schools (identified as High Schools A, B, C, D and E for this report) in the Fort Worth Independent School District. Schools A, B, and C were on the trimester schedule; School C is all black. Two groups of students met in each school, with approximately 17 students in each group. Each group had a trained leader, usually a faculty member or counselor, meeting with the group. Some groups utilized co-trainers who were students participating in the program during the summer. Trainers for the groups were chosen by the students in the schools involved from a list of available faculty members who had the Human Relations Laboratory at an earlier time. Most of the trainers were inexperienced in working with this type of program but most had previously worked with groups of students.

The schedule of activities varied at each school due to variation in the length of each training session. Sessions at High School A were 80 minutes long, and the students met three times a week. At High Schools B and C, students met every day for 80 minute sessions. Students at High Schools D and F met every day for 55 minute sessions.

Sample Description

Selection procedures for determining which students participated in the training sessions differed at each school. At School D the Leadership Committee, a division of the Student Council, recommended students who

they thought would benefit from this type of program. The majority of students recommended were Student Council members and other recognized student leaders. At High School A all Student Council members participated in the training sessions being held during regular Student Council meetings.

At High School E an attempt was made to have all segments of the study body represented in the training sessions. From a list of students available during the times the sessions were to be conducted counselors, teachers, and students made recommendations. They were instructed to choose those people who had leadership potentialities, who would benefit from this type of leadership training program, but who were not necessarily student leaders at this time. Teachers nominated students to attend the training sessions at Schools B and C.

Tables 1 through 7 in Appendix A give a breakdown by school and group on the questions from the Student Survey. This information can be used to construct a picture of the groups as to their makeup and to detect differences between groups and schools. The enrollment procedures described above had the most effect on the composition of the groups.

The sex composition of the groups as shown in Table 1 did not seem to differ systematically as a result of subject enrollment. School D's two groups both showed a dominance by females. The groups in the other four schools did not show a significant dominance in either direction.

Tables 2 and 3 of Appendix A concerning age and grade of the training groups are related. Schools A and E both showed an even distribution across age and grade levels because of their enrollment procedures. However, only School E purposely tried to involve all grade and age levels in the school.

Ethnicity of the training groups as illustrated in Table 4 in Appendix A seemed to be a function of the school population rather than enrollment

procedures. However, there was a predominance of whites in all groups except those at School C which is predominantly black. Even at School E where the enrollment procedures attempted to obtain representatives of all groups within the school, the group makeup was still dominated by whites with only a few blacks and no brown students in the groups.

Tables 5 through 7 in Appendix A better illustrate the differences in enrollment procedures, especially the difference between those procedures used at School E and those procedures used at the other high school involved in the Leadership Laboratory training program. In nearly every other group the students held at least one office in the school and frequently more than one office, while School E students in the training groups usually held no offices. Differences were not so apparent when the students were questioned about offices held in organizations outside of school. Most students seemed to be more involved with school activities to the exclusion of activities outside the school atmosphere. In Table 7 of Appendix A the difference is again apparent with a lesser number of School E students belonging to clubs and organizations than students in the other high schools.

Testing Procedures

Adequate evaluation of the Leadership Laboratory training program necessitated the use of a pretest-posttest design. In order to measure change in interpersonal skills and personality characteristics as specified in the objectives, pretests were administered at the beginning of the training sessions and again at the end of the training sessions. Objective instruments involved in this pre and posttesting were the California Psychological Inventory(CPI) and the Intellectual Achievement Responsibility (IAR). These instruments were identified by the Thiokol Chemical Corporation as appropriate to the objectives of the program.

Several other instruments collected a variety of information about the groups and about the training procedures. Student Surveys gathered information on the composition of the groups involved in the training program. Another instrument, the Student Questionnaire, collected feedback information from the students on the effectiveness of the training program and criticism of the laboratory components. Exercise 22-A from the training manual was completed by the students to rate the laboratory components. The trainers kept a log of comments about the exercises and a record of comments received about the program.

Variations did occur from the scheduled testing program. Some of the groups did not receive the pretest instruments until more than one week of training sessions had been held. The posttests were administered at the end of the training sessions. Students were instructed to mail in the answer sheets as the tests were given out at the last training session. Unfortunately not all of the posttests were returned. Another problem developed because the students did not use the same identifying number of the pretest and on the posttest. This, along with the non-return of the posttest, caused the sample of the CPI and the IAR to be biased as not all students in the training program were sampled.

Instruments

The California Psychological Inventory (CPI) developed by Harrison Gough is a measure of attainment of certain personality characteristics important for social living and social interaction. There are four categories of characteristics covering 18 subscales. This instrument was empirically developed from a pool of test items. Each subscale was constructed separately but intercorrelations are available for pairs of subscales. A description of the scales from the CPI is in Appendix B.

The Intellectual Achievement Responsibility (IAR) is designed to measure to the degree to which the student feels he is responsible for his school successes and failures or the degree to which he feels school achievement is outside his control. It limits the source of external control to those persons who most often come in face-to-face contact with a child, his parent, teachers, and peers. The scale is constructed to sample an equal number of positive and negatige events. Thus, the IAR shows a total responsibility score and separate subscores for beliefs in internal responsibility for successes and for failures.

Two instruments were created specifically for this evaluation project. Samples of both are in Appendix B. The Student Survey gathered biographical information on the students involved in the program. The Student Questionnaire was designed to elicit ratings and subjective comments about the program from participating students.

RESULTS

The pretest and posttest results of the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) are presented in Tables 8 through 25 of Appendix A. Means are given by scale and by school. To test the differences between pretest and posttest means, t-tests were computed. These values are shown in the column to the right in each table. None of the t-values were large enough to be termed significant either for the total group or for groups of individual schools. Personality characteristics and interpersonal skills represented by the scales of the CPI did not change over the period of the training sessions enough to be termed a significant change. Students showed the greatest improvement on the scales measuring 1) tolerance and 2) psychological mindedness.

Pretest and posttest means for the Intellectual Achievement Responsibility (IAR) instrument are presented in Tables 26 through 28 in Appendix A. Results are given for the entire sample only. T-tests were computed to test the differences between the pretest and posttest means. These t-values were found to be significant at the .001 level for the total score and the negative score, and at the .05 level for the positive score. Personality characteristics and interpersonal skills represented by the IAR showed a significant change over the period during which training sessions were held.

Tables 29 and 30 in Appendix A give mean results from the Student Questionnaire that could be quantified. Item 1 from the questionnaire shows favorable means by school and group for Part A of that question. Part B of

Item 1 received ratings more toward the middle of the rating scale but still on the favorable end. Part C received ratings at the middle of the rating scale or slightly below. It should be noted that on each part of Item 1 ratings from School A were among the lowest ratings given for that part. Ratings for Item 2 were very favorable for all schools and groups except for the two groups from School A.

There were five other questions on the Student Questionnaire where the students were asked to give criticism of and comments on the various parts of the Leadership Laboratory training program. These comments and criticisms were compiled by school and by group in an attempt to find a concensus of opinion on these subjective items. Item 1 of the subjective items attempted to find out from the students what kind of students they thought would benefit most from this type of training. A large majority of the students replied that "all types of students would benefit", especially those who were "prejudiced" and "shy", and those who "had leadership potential" that needed to be developed. Students felt that the "discussions" and "having communication" with those of other races and about prejudice were the strengths of the training sessions. Students gave very specific and constructive criticisms on the weaknesses of the training sessions such as "not enough time for discussion", "some exercises began to get boring", and "not getting the racial groups balanced" in each group. Changes were recommended by the students in keeping with the above weaknesses. Students were asked to make additional comments about the laboratory experience. Excerpts from these comments will be further discussed in the Discussion section. It should be noted that many more negative comments were received from the students at School A than at any other school.

It was impossible to compile in any meaningful manner the comments of the trainers as recorded in their daily logs. The comments were too specific in nature and primarily pertained to the activities in the individual groups. Excerpts from these logs will be utilized in the following sections of the report.

CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The Leadership Laboratory did not change to a significant degree those interpersonal skills and personality characteristics that are supposedly measured by the California Psychological Inventory (CPI). However, improvement was shown on two CPI scales, Tolerance and Psychological Mindedness. The training sessions did change the students with respect to controlling their destiny as measured by the Intellectual Achievement Responsibility (IAR) instrument. Subjective comments from students appear to be on the favorable side at nearly all schools, with the students giving many constructive criticisms and comments that will be helpful in revising the laboratory components. These student leaders expressed the opinion that the course would be valuable for all students. Only the groups from School A expressed a large number of negative statements about the laboratory experience.

Discussion

Standardized Instruments

The laboratory experience did not show a change in the characteristics and skills that the CPI is said to measure. Several reasons need to be mentioned that may have played a part in causing no change to be noted. Poor posttest return on this instrument resulted in using a biased sample. In some groups the pretest was not given until after the beginning of the sessions, causing an already short experimental period to be further shortened.

The short length of the experimental period may have been the primary cause for no change to show on the fairly stable personality characteristics represented by the scales of the CPI.

It should be noted, however, that two definite trends appeared on the CPI which are highly related to the program objectives of the Leadership Laboratory. First of all, students showed improvement on the scale measuring Tolerance or the ability to be accepting and non-judgmental about others' social beliefs and attitudes. Secondly, a trend in the direction of increased Psychological Mindedness or the degree to which an individual is interested in, and responsive to, the inner needs and experiences of others appeared. These two findings are most consistent with the stated program objective of acquainting the student with the importance of human relations skills and increasing ability to be sensitive to those around him.

No systematic differences between schools was apparent from the results of the CPI.

The results from the IAR did show an increase over the experimental period. The laboratory experience did make a difference in the extent to which students felt they were able to control their destiny and be responsible for both positive and negative events occurring to them. Not only were these findings significant but in a manner which surprised even the investigators. That is, after the laboratory experience, students were more willing to assume responsibility for the negative events in their life than they were the positive! In other words, learners indicated that if they had been instrumental in setting up situations that produced negative consequences (i.e., poor grades, etc.) then they were willing to take responsibility for their behavior without blaming teachers, parents, or peers. This finding is indeed consistent with the program objective of giving students a clearer understanding

of their role and responsibility as a leader. Results were not identified as to school or group so differences among these categories could not be detected if they were present.

Student Reports

The majority of comments and ratings on the Student Questionnaire were favorable and offered constructive criticism of the laboratory. The students felt that they "learned a great deal about compromising and working together to solve problems" and were "taught....how to get along with people and not to judge people by what they have on or by what other people say about them". One student commented....

> "I am a black student, and I didn't believe that I could adjust so well and become so close in feeling the way that I do with white students. I really think that this course is necessary for integration because there are other blacks who feel the same as I did".

Those students at School E offered support for a school-wide program of this sort because of the help they felt it had given them in their interpersonal relationships, especially those with people of other races. Negative comments were noted most frequently from students at School A on the Student Questionnaire. The students there felt that the program was "a handicap to our Student Council" and were "elated that it" was "over with". They also had criticisms of the program components which they said "should be geared to the individual schools".

This disparity in types of comments received from School A and the other four schools can be attributed to differences in the enrollment procedures used at School A and at the other four schools. School A students participating in the program were all Student Council members and did not volunteer to participate but were instructed to set aside part of their Student Council

meeting time each week to devote to the training sessions. Students at the other schools volunteered to participate in the program, and the trainers at these schools reported that many other students wanted to be involved in the next program of this type conducted at their school after they had been exposed to the enthusiastic reports of the participating students. The above points out the importance of having the enthusiastic cooperation of the participants with a program of this type.

Another facet of the enrollment procedure involved the type of student participating in the program. Tables 5 through 7 in Appendix A showed the students at School E to be less involved in the leadership and organizational roles in their schools than students at the other schools. The students at School E had more room for change, and their leadership potential had not been utilized to a great extent so they were more receptive to the program components offering them new experiences in leadership roles.

Trainers' Reports

The daily logs of the trainers were a source of specific comments about the laboratory components which along with the student comments will provide a basis for revision of the training manual. The trainers also recorded comments about the laboratory from participating students, faculty members, and parents.

During the course of the training sessions students reported that they had "begun to change" as a result of feedback from the group during the sessions. One trainer reported that faculty members had commented to her the fact that "a participating student attached importance to being chosen for the group". Several parents responded with positive comments about the help that the laboratory experience had given to their children. In one group the trainer

charted the progress of one student who when he came to the group sessions had been doing poorly in his classes the previous semester due to his unorthodox appearnce. This student reported that "he had regained some self-confidence and now wanted to participate in class discussions". His history teacher reported favorable change in him and his increased classroom participation. Negative comments were also noted by the trainers but these primarily concerned specific aspects of the exercises.

Trainers voted that in future laboratories there should be a scheduled class for students and teachers, but it should be a non-credit course. The trainers felt that giving credit for the course would change the psychological tone of the laboratories.

Recommendations

From the results of objective testing and subjective evaluation by students and trainers participating in the Leadership Laboratory, the following specific recommendations can be made concerning enrollment procedures.

1. Participating students should be volunteers
2. Groups should include, as far as possible, a cross-section of the student body, with racial groups represented
3. An enrollment procedure similar to the one used at School E would be the most desirable where feasible to use such a procedure.

Trainer selection procedures described in this report are satisfactory to both students and trainers. Having the students select those faculty members with whom they feel they can best relate is a desirable procedure because the students will then feel that they have played a large part in choosing the people with whom they will work in the groups.

The following recommendations concern future evaluation efforts which should be undertaken to provide for future revision of the program and more extensive evaluation of the effects of the program.

1. Testing procedures and instruments to be used should be set up well in advance of the beginning of the training sessions.
2. Specific objectives should be written for the Leadership Laboratory to facilitate evaluation of the effects of the training sessions.
3. Ideally, unobstrusive measurement instruments and/or a single subject time series design could be used to yield more specific, descriptive data on student growth.
4. A pretest-posttest design, with a control group if feasible, should be utilized in future evaluation efforts.
5. Subjective comments should continue to be solicited from students and trainers to aid in revision of the program.

Program components should be revised in accordance with the comments given by students and trainers.

Summary Recommendation

It is recommended that the Leadership Laboratory be offered to students in other high schools in the Fort Worth Independent School District along with further evaluation of its effects on the participating students in line with the above recommendations.

APPENDIX A

Table 1. Sex of Training Groups

School / Group		Number		Percentage	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
C	1	1	5	17	83
	2	3	6	30	60
D	1	3	10	21	71
	2	5	10	33	67
B	1	4	10	29	71
	2	4	6	40	60
A	1	6	9	40	60
	2	10	7	56	39
E	1	9	5	60	33
	2	8	7	53	47
Summary		53	75	40	57

Table 2. Age of Training Groups

School / Group		Number Aged...						Percentage Aged...					
		13	14	15	16	17	18	13	14	15	16	17	18
C	1			3	2		1			50	33		17
	2		4	3	1	2			40	30	10	20	
D	1			1	4	8	1			7	29	57	7
	2			1	1	11	2			7	7	73	14
B	1		2	6	1	4	1		14	43	7	29	7
	2		1	4	2	3			10	40	20	30	
A	1		5	3	3	3	1		33	20	20	20	7
	2		3	5	3	5	2		17	28	17	28	11
E	1	1	1	3	6	4		7	7	20	40	27	
	2		2	2	7	4			13	13	47	27	
Summary		1	18	31	30	44	8	.8	14	23	23	33	6

Table 3. Grade of Training Groups

School / Group		Number in Grade				Percentage in Grade			
		9	10	11	12	9	10	11	12
C	1		4		2		67		33
	2	4	4	1	1	40	40	10	10
D	1			9	4			64	29
	2		1	2	12		7	13	80
B	1	4	3	5	2	29	21	36	14
	2	3	3	4		30	30	40	
A	1	4	4	3	4	27	27	20	27
	2	4	4	4	6	22	22	22	33
E	1	2	3	9	1	13	20	60	7
	2	1	3	7	3	7	20	47	20
Summary		22	29	44	35	17	22	33	27

Table 4. Ethnicity of Training Groups

School / Group		Number			Percentage		
		Black	Brown	White	Black	Brown	White
C	1	6			100		
	2	10			100		
D	1			14			100
	2	1	3	11	7	20	73
B	1		2	12		14	86
	2		2	8		20	80
A	1			15			100
	2			18			100
E	1	2		13	13		87
	2	3		12	20		80
Summary		22	7	103	17	5	78

Table 5

Question 1: How many school offices do you presently hold?

School / Group	Number of Students Holding..					Percentage				
	0 offices	1 offices	2 offices	3 offices	4 offices	0 offices	1 offices	2 offices	3 offices	4 offices
C 1	4	1	1			67	17	17		
2	5	5				50	50			
D 1	4	7	2	1		29	50	14	7	
2	4	8	3			27	53	20		
B 1	3	3	5	3		21	21	36	21	
2	2	4	3	1		20	40	30	10	
A 1	1	10	3	1		7	67	20	7	
2		12	5		1		67	28		6
E 1	10	4			1	67	27			7
2	10	3	1	1		67	20	7	7	
Summary	43	57	23	7	2	33	43	17	5	2

Table 6

Question 2: How many offices or positions do you presently hold in other organizations, clubs, institutions, etc.?

School / Group	Number of Students Holding..				Percentage			
	0 offices	1 offices	2 offices	3 offices	0 offices	1 offices	2 offices	3 offices
C 1	5		1		83		17	
2	7	2		1	70	20		10
D 1	6	5	3		43	36	21	
2	13		2		87		13	
B 1	11	2	1		79	14	7	
2	8	2			80	20		
A 1	12	2	1		80	13	7	
2	10	6	1	1	56	33	6	6
E 1	11	3	1		73	20	7	
2	12	1	1	1	80	7	7	7
Summary	95	23	11	3	72	17	8	2

Table 7

Question 3: How many clubs, organizations, committees, etc. do you presently belong to?

School / Group	Number of Students Belonging to..						Percentage					
	0 Club	1 Club	2 Clubs	3 Clubs	4 Clubs	5+ Clubs	0 Club	1 Club	2 Clubs	3 Clubs	4 Clubs	5+ Clubs
C 1		2		3		1		33		50		17
2	1	3	4	2			10	30	40	20		
D 1		2	5	2	2	3		14	36	14	14	21
2	1	1	5	5	2	1	7	7	33	33	13	7
B 1		5	5	2	2			36	36	14	14	
2	1	2	5	2			10	20	50	20		
A 1	1	1	3	7	1	2	7	7	20	47	7	13
2		6	4	4	1	3		33	22	22	6	17
E 1	4	3	2	5		1	27	20	13	33		7
2	6	3	4		1	1	40	20	27		7	7
Summary	14	28	37	32	9	12	11	21	28	24	7	9

Table 8

Dominance Subscale 1, CPI

"To assess factors of leadership ability, dominance, persistence, and social initiative"

School	Number*	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	"t"
C	7	51.57	55.29	0.71
D	9	55.22	59.78	0.76
B	6	59.67	59.83	0.02
A	22	52.59	53.77	0.32
E	27	49.00	50.85	0.53
Summary	71	52.04	54.08	0.98

*Number of pretests and posttests that were matched.

Table 9

Capacity for Status Subscale 2, CPI

"To serve as an index of an individual's capacity for status (not his actual or achieved status). The scale attempts to measure the personal qualities and attributes which underlie and lead to status.

School	Number*	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	"t"
C	7	48.57	45.43	0.49
D	9	52.56	51.00	0.34
B	6	47.00	54.50	1.14
A	22	43.36	46.82	1.07
E	27	38.11	40.81	0.98
Summary	71	43.35	45.58	1.17

*Number of pretests and posttests that were matched.

Table 10

Sociability Subscale 3, CPI

"To identify persons of outgoing, sociable, participative temperament"

School	Number*	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	"t"
C	7	53.00	57.17	0.79
D	9	51.78	53.89	0.41
B	6	54.33	58.00	0.79
A	22	49.36	51.32	0.72
E	27	47.04	46.74	0.10
Summary	71	49.56	50.73	0.66

*Number of pretests and posttests that were matched.

Table 11

Social Presence Subscale 4, CPI

"To assess factors such as poise, spontaneity, and self-confidence in personal and social interaction"

School	Number*	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	"t"
C	7	47.71	49.29	0.39
D	9	56.11	53.77	0.52
B	6	54.17	55.17	0.26
A	22	51.73	50.68	0.33
E	27	47.89	48.33	0.16
Summary	71	50.63	50.42	0.13

*Number of pretests and posttests that were matched.

Table 12

Self-Acceptance Subscale 5, CPI

"To assess factors such as sense of personal worth, self-acceptance, and capacity for independent thinking and action"

School	Number*	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	"T"
C	7	56.57	57.71	0.22
D	9	64.00	63.89	0.02
B	6	65.33	63.83	0.29
A	22	59.41	58.27	0.35
E	27	52.00	52.37	0.12
Summary	71	57.39	57.15	0.12

*Number of pretests and posttests that were matched.

Table 13

Sense of Well-Being Subscale 6, CPI

"To identify persons who minimize their worries and complaints, and who are relatively free from self-doubt and disillusionment"

School	Number*	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	"t"
C	7	33.43	33.43	0.00
D	9	38.78	40.56	0.30
B	6	33.83	37.83	0.51
A	22	36.05	39.64	0.77
E	27	35.96	36.19	0.05
Summary	71	35.92	37.68	0.72

*Number of pretests and posttests that were matched.

Table 14

Responsibility Subscale 7, CPI

"To identify persons of conscientious, responsible, and dependable disposition and temperament"

School	Number*	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	"t"
C	7	48.86	47.43	0.39
D	9	43.22	47.22	0.94
B	6	41.33	47.00	0.71
A	22	45.64	47.55	0.71
E	27	41.85	43.93	0.79
Summary	71	43.85	46.07	1.41

*Number of pretests and posttests that were matched.

Table 15

Socialization Subscale 8, CPI

"To indicate the degree of social maturity, integrity, and rectitude which the individual has attained"

School	Number*	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	"t"
C	7	51.86	48.14	0.70
D	9	50.44	50.89	0.08
B	6	44.17	47.00	0.35
A	22	49.32	49.45	0.04
E	27	45.67	45.33	0.09
Summary	71	47.89	47.73	0.08

*Number of pretests and posttests that were matched.

Table 16

Self-Control Subscale 9, CPI

"To assess the degree and adequacy of self-regulation and self-control and freedom from impulsivity and self-centeredness"

School	Number*	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	"t"
C	7	45.71	44.57	0.20
D	9	36.56	39.67	0.62
B	6	35.67	40.67	0.69
A	22	35.86	41.18	1.73
E	27	38.22	40.48	0.85
Summary	71	37.80	41.01	1.86

*Number of pretests and posttests that were matched.

Table 17

Tolerance Subscale 10, CPI

"To identify persons with permissive, accepting, and non-judgemental social beliefs and attitude"

School	Number*	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	"t"
C	7	39.14	33.00	1.20
D	9	41.44	43.56	0.39
B	6	37.67	46.33	1.27
A	22	39.41	43.45	1.18
E	27	38.22	43.22	1.71
Summary	71	39.04	42.59	1.93

*Number of pretests and posttests that were matched.

Table 18

Good Impression Subscale 11, CPI

"To identify persons capable of creating a favorable impression and who are concerned about how others react to them"

School	Number*	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	"t"
C	7	46.57	48.00	0.24
D	9	39.33	40.89	0.43
B	6	41.17	46.83	1.17
A	22	37.32	40.18	0.95
E	27	39.04	40.19	0.43
Summary	71	39.46	41.61	1.31

*Number of pretests and posttests that were matched.

Table 19

Communality Subscale 12, CPI

"To indicate the degree to which an individual's reactions and responses correspond to the modal ('common') pattern established for the inventory"

School	Number*	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	"t"
C	7	50.14	49.43	0.17
D	9	51.89	51.22	0.23
B	6	50.33	34.17	1.44
A	22	48.45	49.23	0.17
E	27	47.41	45.77	0.40
Summary	71	48.82	46.92	0.80

*Number of pretests and posttests that were matched.

Table 20

Achievement via Conformance Subscale 13, CPI

"To identify those factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in any setting where conformance is a positive behavior"

School	Number*	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	"t"
C	7	51.86	48.57	0.64
D	9	44.56	48.89	0.90
B	6	46.83	50.17	0.57
A	22	41.41	43.73	0.66
E	27	40.30	40.30	0.00
Summary	71	42.87	44.10	0.63

*Number of pretests and posttests that were matched.

Table 21

Achievement via Independence Subscale 14, CPI

"To identify those factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in any setting where autonomy and independence are positive behaviors"

School	Number*	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	"t"
C	7	41.71	40.43	0.42
D	9	46.33	49.89	0.54
B	6	47.17	52.50	1.03
A	22	44.18	47.95	1.65
E	27	44.37	45.19	0.28
Summary	71	44.54	46.79	1.37

*Number of pretests and posttests that were matched.

Table 22

Intellectual Efficiency Subscale 15, CPI

"To indicate the degree of personal and intellectual efficiency which the individual has attained"

School	Number*	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	"t"
C	7	39.00	39.86	0.15
D	9	45.78	44.89	0.16
B	6	42.00	42.00	0.00
A	22	41.00	41.64	0.19
E	27	39.52	40.67	0.35
Summary	71	40.93	41.54	0.31

*Number of pretests and posttests that were matched.

Table 23

Psychological-Mindedness Subscale 16, CPI

"To measure the degree to which the individual is interested in, and responsive to, the inner needs, motives, and experiences of others"

School	Number*	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	"t"
C	7	48.00	49.71	0.40
D	9	48.89	54.11	1.58
B	6	49.83	49.17	0.10
A	22	45.32	47.09	0.69
E	27	46.48	50.19	1.62
Summary	71	46.86	49.59	1.93

*Number of pretests and posttests that were matched.

Table 24

Flexibility Subscale 17, CPI

"To indicate the degree of flexibility and adaptability of a person's thinking and social behavior"

School	Number*	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	"t"
C	7	48.43	44.29	0.91
D	9	52.22	53.78	0.27
B	6	49.17	48.83	0.07
A	22	53.64	54.82	0.35
E	27	55.22	53.96	0.52
Summary	71	53.17	52.82	0.21

*Number of pretests and posttests that were matched.

Table 25

Femininity Subscale 18, CPI

"To assess the masculinity or femininity of interests (high scores indicate more feminine interests, low scores more masculine)"

School	Number*	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	"t"
C	7	64.71	68.43	0.52
D	9	50.22	53.67	0.54
B	6	51.50	60.67	1.46
A	22	52.95	56.18	1.08
E	27	50.11	49.56	0.19
Summary	71	52.56	54.93	1.18

*Number of pretests and posttests that were matched.

Table 26

Pretest and Posttest Means and T-Test Values for the Intellectual Achievement Responsibility: Total Score

	Number	Mean	"t"
Pretest	130	25.79	
Posttest	59	28.05	3.62*

*Significant at .001 level, two tailed test.

Table 27

Pretest and Posttest Means and T-Test Values for the Intellectual Achievement Responsibility: Negative Score

	Number	Mean	"t"
Pretest	127	12.61	
Posttest	57	13.84	3.30*

*Significant at .001 level, two tailed test.

Table 28

Pretest and Posttest Means and T-Test Values for the Intellectual Achievement Responsibility: Positive Score

	Number	Mean	"t"
Pretest	129	13.27	
Posttest	59	14.15	2.14*

*Significant at .05 level, two tailed test.

Table 29

Means for Student Questionnaire
Item 1: Rate the laboratory experience to the degree that it has made you deal more effectively with problems that student leaders encounter:
5-point scale

School / Group		Fellow Students	Faculty Members & Administrators	Parents and Members of the Community
C	1	3.50	3.50	3.25
	2	4.80	4.00	4.60
D	1	4.30	4.10	3.30
	2	4.11	3.44	2.78
B	1	4.45	4.45	3.73
	2	4.75	4.00	4.00
A	1	3.25	3.38	2.38
	2	3.88	3.50	2.50
E	1	4.50	4.08	3.83
	2	3.73	3.64	3.45
Total*		4.12	3.85	3.36

*Also includes student evaluations with no school and/or group indicated.

Table 30

Means for Student Questionnaire
Item 2: How much value do you feel this experience would have for other students?
5-point scale

School / Group		Mean
C	1	5.00
	2	5.00
D	1	4.40
	2	4.11
B	1	4.73
	2	4.25
A	1	2.88
	2	3.13
E	1	5.00
	2	4.27
Total*		4.30

*Also includes student evaluations with no school and/or group indicated.

APPENDIX B

SCHOOLS AND TRAINERS IN THE

LEADERSHIP LABORATORY PROGRAM

Fall, 1972

SCHOOLS	TRAINERS
Southwest High School	Ed York
	Marilyn Kirkham
Eastern Hills High School	Annette Blaschke
	Walter Barbour
Dunbar High School	Nancy Dobbins
	Rodney Stanaland
Diamond Hill-Jarvis High School	Beverly Houck
	Marilyn Kirkham
Paschal High School	Norma Headrick
	Marjory Philp

CALIFORNIA PSYCHOLOGICAL INVENTORY

Class I. Measures of Poise, Ascendancy, Self-Assurance and Interpersonal Adequacy

1. Do (Dominance) To assess factors of leadership ability, dominance, persistence, and social initiative.

2. Cs (Capacity for status) To serve as an index of an individual's capacity for status (not his actual or achieved status). The scale attempts to measure the personal qualities and attributes which underlie and lead to status.

3. Sy (Sociability) To identify persons of outgoing, sociable, participative temperament.

4. Sp (Social presence) To assess factors such as poise, spontaneity, and self-confidence in personal and social interaction.

5. Sa (Self-acceptance) To assess factors such as sense of personal worth, self-acceptance, and capacity for independent thinking and action.

6. Wb (Sense of well-being) To identify persons who minimize their worries and complaints, and who are relatively free from self-doubt and disillusionment.

Class II. Measures of Socialization, Maturity, Responsibility and Intrapersonal Structuring of Values

7. Re (Responsibility) To identify persons of conscientious, responsible, and dependable disposition and temperament.

8. So (Socialization) To indicate the degree of social maturity, integrity, and rectitude which the individual has attained.

9. Sc (Self-control) To assess the degree and adequacy of self-regulation and self-control and freedom from impulsivity and self-centeredness.

10. To (Tolerance) To identify persons with permissive, accepting, and non-judgemental social beliefs and attitude.

11. Gi (Good impression) To identify persons capable of creating a favorable impression and who are concerned about how others react to them.

12. Cm (Communality) To indicate the degree to which an individual's reactions and responses correspond to the modal ("common") pattern established for the inventory.

Class III. Measures of Achievement Potential and Intellectual Efficiency

13. Ac (Achievement via conformance) To identify those factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in any setting where conformance is a positive behavior.

14. Ai (Achievement via independence) To identify those factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in any setting where autonomy and independence are positive behaviors.

15. Ie (Intellectual efficiency) To indicate the degree of personal and intellectual efficiency which the individual has attained.

Class IV. Measures of Intellectual and Interest Modes

16. Py (Psychological-mindedness) To measure the degree to which the individual is interested in, and responsive to, the inner needs, motives, and experiences of others.

17. Fx (Flexibility) To indicate the degree of flexibility and adaptability of a person's thinking and social behavior.

18. Fe (Femininity) To assess the masculinity or femininity of interests. (High scores indicate more feminine interests, low scores more masculine.)

EXAMPLE PAGE: Intellectual Achievement Responsibility

PART I

DIRECTIONS: Below are some situations in which you commonly find yourself. We are interested in how you would usually respond to these situations. For each situation there are two choices. For each situation, make one choice (either a or b) that expresses the way you would usually feel.

1. If a teacher passes you to the next grade, would it probably be

____a. because she liked you, or
____b. because of the work you did?

2. When you do well on a test at school, is it more likely to be

____a. because you studied for it, or
____b. because the test was especially easy?

3. When you have trouble understanding something at school, is it usually

____a. because the teacher didn't explain it clearly, or
____b. because you didn't listen carefully?

4. When you read a story and can't remember much of it, is it usually

____a. because the story wasn't well written, or
____b. because you weren't interested in the story?

5. Suppose your parents say you are doing well in school. Is this likely to happen

____a. because your school work is good, or
____b. because they are in a good mood?

6. Suppose you did better than usual in a subject at school. Would it probably happen

____a. because you tried harder, or
____b. because someone helped you?

7. When you lose at a game of cards or checkers, does it usually happen

____a. because the other player is good at the game, or
____b. because you don't play well?

8. Suppose a person doesn't think you are very bright or clever

____a. can you make him change his mind if you try, or
____b. are there some people who will think you're not very bright no matter what you do?

9. If you solved a puzzle quickly, is it

____a. because it wasn't a very hard puzzle, or
____b. because you worked on it carefully?

10. If a boy or girl tells you that you are dumb, is it more likely they say that

____a. because they are mad at you, or
____b. because what you did really wasn't very bright?

STUDENT SURVEY

Identification Number _____

Circle One

Sex:	Male	Female				
Age:	14	15	16	17	18	19
Grade:	10	11	12			
Ethnicity:	black	brown	white			

1. What school offices do you presently hold? _____

_____

_____

2. What offices or positions do you presently hold in other organizations, clubs, institutions, etc.? _____

_____

_____

3. To what clubs, organizations, committees, etc. you presently belong?

_____

_____

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

This instrument is designed to provide the Fort Worth Independent School District with important data concerning the future use of the Student Leadership Training. Do not sign your name. Fill out the information required and answer the questions. Use the envelope provided to send this instrument to the Research Department.

Time of Session (Circle one): A.M. Noon P.M.

School _____ I.D. #_____

We are asking you to rate your answers to the following two questions on a 1 to 5 scale, based upon your personal experiences in this program. Circle the numeral after each question that best applies to your rating.

Scale: 1 = None 5 = Very much

1. Rate the laboratory experience to the degree that it has made you deal more effectively with problems that student leaders encounter with:

   a. fellow students 1 2 3 4 5

   b. faculty members and administrators 1 2 3 4 5

   c. parents and members of the community 1 2 3 4 5

2. How much value do you feel this experience would have for other students in your school?

   1 2 3 4 5

Please respond with comments to the following five questions. Use the back of this paper if necessary.

1. What kinds of students would benefit most from this type of leadership training?

   _____

2. What do you feel were the most outstanding strengths of the laboratory?

   _____

3. What do you feel were the most outstanding weaknesses of the laboratory?

   _____

4. What changes in the laboratory would you recommend to improve its effectiveness with others?

   _____

5. Any other comments? _____

   _____